

Remarks

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-8, 14-26 and 33-41 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 14-17, 39 and 41 are independent claims.

Independent Claims 1, 14-17, 39 and 41 and corresponding dependent Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 18, 19, 22-26, 33, 35, 38 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Gill *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,081,262 (“Gill”) in view of Protheroe *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,414,686 (“Protheroe”). Dependent Claims 4, 5, 20, 21, 34 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Gill in view of Protheroe and Fields *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,128,655 (“Fields”). *

Claims 1, 14-17 and 38-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

II. Summary of Applicants’ Reply

Applicants have cancelled independent Claim 41 without prejudice. The 35 U.S.C. §§ 103 and 112 rejections of Claim 41 are therefore moot. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of Claim 41 in one or more continuing applications related to the present application.

Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to define, *inter alia*, the
“automatic[] identifying . . . [of] multimedia content having a tag by parsing a page”
“subsequent to receiving user selection input while said page is accessed through a multimedia

* No specific rejection of dependent Claim 37 was made in the Office Action. Thus, applicants believe that claim 37 was objected to for depending from a rejected independent claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. If applicants’ belief is incorrect, applicants request clarification from the Examiner in the next Office Action.

content application.” Independent Claims 14-17, and 39 (through its incorporation of Claim 1), have been amended to include similar features. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection is respectfully traversed. These amendments are being made strictly to advance prosecution of this application to allowance. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the unamended claims in one or more continuing applications related to the present application.

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 14-17 and 38 in order to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have broadened independent Claims 1, 14-17 and 39 in that these claims no longer require the “activating [of] a presentation window.” Features related to such a presentation window are now set forth in, for example, amended dependent Claims 33 and 35. Additionally, the independent claims no longer require the accessed page to include “a plurality of” multimedia content.

Applicants have inserted new independent claim 42. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration and allowance of this application in light of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The independent claims (i.e., Claims 1, 14-17 and 39) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Gill in view of Protheroe.

The independent claims are directed to methods, apparatus, computer-readable medium and a signal readable by a computer for building a presentation. Generally, the

claims relate to copying multimedia content from a media source to memory, for subsequent access by a presentation application. More particularly, all of the independent claims require the accessing of a page including multimedia content from a media source through a media content application (e.g., a browser). Strictly for purposes of expediting prosecution, Claim 1 has been amended to define the “automatic[] identifying . . . [of] multimedia content having a tag by parsing a page” and “copying said multimedia content having said tag, from said multimedia source to memory, for access by a presentation application” “subsequent to receiving user selection input while said page is accessed through said multimedia content application.” Claims 14-17 and 39 have been amended to define similar features. Dependent Claims 2-8, 18-25 and 33-38 have been amended to align claim language with the antecedent basis set forth in the independent claims. Support for these amendments can be found in the originally-filed application at, for example, page 7, line 24 to page 8, line 22. As described in applicants’ specification, the automatic parsing of pages and storing the result in memory improves upon conventional ways for identifying and storing multimedia content, such as history, bookmarks, cache memory and manual saving (*see e.g.* the Background section of applicants’ specification).

In contrast, Gill taken alone or in combination with Protheroe fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, applicants’ claimed features of “automatically identifying multimedia content having a tag by parsing a page” and “copying said multimedia content having said tag, from said multimedia source to memory, for access by a presentation application” “subsequent to receiving user selection input while said page is accessed through a multimedia content

application.”* In fact, while Gill discloses that information for inclusion in a presentation can be “downloaded from external sources . . . such as Internet S4” (Gill, col. 5, l. 65 to col. 6, l. 8), Gill is silent as to how its system identifies and copies the information. Stated another way, Gill does not teach or suggest any approach that can be used to identify and copy information from an external source such as the Internet (e.g., manual identification and saving, as described in the Background section of applicants’ specification), much less teach or suggest applicants’ particular approach of “automatically identifying multimedia content having a tag by parsing a page” and “copying said multimedia content having said tag . . .” “subsequent to receiving user selection input . . .” Protheroe fails to make up for this deficiency in Gill, as Protheroe merely relates to a video editing system in which video clips are added to a video sequence using a curved time line (see e.g. Protheroe, Abstract). Protheroe allows a user to review video clips and select portions thereof (i.e., “trimming”) (*see e.g.* Protheroe, col. 2, ll. 42-51 and col. 6, l. 38-55), but this is not the same as “automatically identifying multimedia content having a tag by parsing a page” and “copying said multimedia content having said tag . . .” “subsequent to receiving user selection input . . .”

Thus, the foregoing demonstrates that independent Claims 1, 14-17 and 39 are allowable over the references of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of independent Claims 1, 14-17 and 39 and corresponding dependent Claims 2-8, 18-26, 33-38 and 40.

* Claims 1-8, 14-26, 33-40 and new Claim 42 (discussed in Section V herein) include additional patentable features. However, these features will not be addressed in this Reply because, as set forth herein, the features discussed in this Reply are sufficient to overcome the references of record. Applicants reserve the right to argue the patentability of the additional features at a later stage if necessary.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 14-17 and 38 in order to address the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection. Particularly, applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite that the user selection input is received while “said page” is accessed by a multimedia application and that “multimedia content having a tag” is copied from a source to memory. Support for these features can be found in the originally-filed application at, for example, page 7, line 24 to page 8, line 22. Claim 39, which incorporates Claim 1, therefore includes these amendments. Applicants have made corresponding amendments to claims 14-17 and 38.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the feature in Claim 40 of “storing, in a presentation file, an indication of an order in which said plurality of pages in said memory are to be accessed by said presentation application” is not enabled by applicants’ specification. See e.g. applicants’ FIG. 8 and applicants’ specification, page 7, line 28 to page 8, line 8 and page 10, lines 1-31. Particularly, FIG. 8 shows the format, including memory index field 58, of content records stored in presentation file 27 (p. 7, l. 28 to p. 8, l. 8). And, applicants’ specification describes that the order can be defined based on the memory index field. For example, applicants’ specification describes that “[u]sing the automatic addressing method, a timer may be employed to display or otherwise provide to the user the multimedia content addressed by the contents of the memory index field 58 for a period of time, before presenting the multimedia content identified by the contents of the memory index field 58 of the next addressed content record” (col. 10, ll. 1-23; emphasis supplied). Applicants respectfully submit that this description in applicants’ specification would enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the claimed “storing . . . [of] an indication of an order.”

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C.
§ 112 rejection of Claims 1, 14-17 and 38-40.

V. New Independent Claim 42

Applicants have inserted new independent Claim 42 for the Examiner's consideration. New Claim 42 includes features similar to the above described features of independent Claims 1, 14-17 and 39. Thus, new Claim 42 is allowable over the references of record for at least the reasons described above.

VI. Contingent Request for Telephonic Interview

If for any reason the Examiner decides not to allow this application based on this Reply, applicants respectfully request a telephonic interview with the Examiner before the issuance of a final Office Action.

VII. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing demonstrates that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Dated: September 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Snell

Reg. No. 52,235
Agent for Applicants
c/o MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS
GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
Chrysler Center
666 Third Avenue, 24th Floor
New York, NY 10017
Tel: (212) 935-3000
Fax: (212) 983-3115